

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 19-1613V

UNPUBLISHED

MELISSA HEFFLEY,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: July 23, 2021

Special Processing Unit (SPU);
Ruling on Entitlement; Concession;
Table Injury; Influenza (Flu) Vaccine;
Shoulder Injury Related to Vaccine
Administration (SIRVA)

Maximillian J. Muller, Muller Brazil, LLP, Dresher, PA, for petitioner.

Camille Michelle Collett, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for respondent.

RULING ON ENTITLEMENT¹

On October 16, 2019, Melissa Heffley filed a petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, 42 U.S.C. §300aa-10, *et seq.*² (the “Vaccine Act”). On July 14, 2021, Petitioner filed an amended petition. In the amended petition, Petitioner alleges that she suffered a shoulder injury related to vaccine administration (“SIRVA”) as a result of an influenza vaccine received on December 7, 2017. Amended Petition at 1. The case was assigned to the Special Processing Unit of the Office of Special Masters.

¹ Because this unpublished ruling contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, I am required to post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims’ website in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002. 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2012) (Federal Management and Promotion of Electronic Government Services). **This means the ruling will be available to anyone with access to the internet.** In accordance with Vaccine Rule 18(b), Petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to redact medical or other information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy. If, upon review, I agree that the identified material fits within this definition, I will redact such material from public access.

² National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755. Hereinafter, for ease of citation, all “§” references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2012).

On May 24, 2021, Respondent filed his Rule 4(c) report in which he concedes that Petitioner is entitled to compensation in this case for SIRVA.³ Respondent's Rule 4(c) Report at 1. Specifically, Respondent agrees that "petitioner had no relevant history of pain, inflammation, or dysfunction in her left shoulder; her pain and reduced range of motion occurred within 48 hours of receipt of an intramuscular vaccination; her symptoms were limited to the shoulder in which the vaccine was administered; and no other condition or abnormality was identified to explain her symptoms." *Id.* at 6.

In view of Respondent's position and the evidence of record, I find that Petitioner is entitled to compensation for SIRVA.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Brian H. Corcoran

Brian H. Corcoran

Chief Special Master

³ Respondent's Rule 4(c) Report took no position on the brachial neuritis claim in the original petition. Petitioner subsequently filed an amended petition asserting only a SIRVA claim.